

In the Office Action the Examiner requested to elect a single invention from the inventions of Groups I, II, III.

The Examiner also indicated that the present application contained two different species namely Figure 2 of Group II and Figures 3-4 of Group III.

It was requested to elect a single invention and a single disclosed species. With the present communication applicants have provisionally elected for further prosecution Group I, or in other words a method of making a pressure pipe.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7 are readable on the elected invention.

At the same time, the Examiner's restriction and election requirements are respectfully traversed. Contrary to the Examiner's statement the method and the device do have common features. In particular, as defined in the method claim 1, the non magnetic intermediary piece 33 is thermally joined at its ends to the pole piece 31 and the tubular piece 35. Claims 8 and 11, in turn, define that the intermediate piece 33 and the tubular piece 35 or the tubular piece 35 and the stroke limiter 36 are thermally joined to one another. Thus, the

method claim 1, as well as the apparatus claims 8 and 11 have the common special technical feature.

As for whether this feature is germane to the issue of the patentability of the device, it is respectfully submitted that this feature can be considered as being a structural feature. Since the corresponding elements are thermally joined to one another, this language does not express the step of joining thermally to one another as a part of a process, but instead it specifies how the corresponding parts structurally interact with one another, in particular they are joined to one another and the joining means (which are structural means) are thermal joining means.

It is therefore believed that there is a unity of the invention in the invention related to the method and in the invention related to the pressure pipe, due to the common technical feature. As for the differences between the structural features of claims 8 and 11, claims 8 and 11 represent different species, and as such, since they have a common technical feature, they should be prosecuted together in the sense of PCT Rule 13.

It is therefore respectfully requested to prosecute in this application all the claims currently on file.

Consideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27233